

REMARKS

The Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection.

Claims 1-28 remain pending.

In acknowledging the claim for foreign priority, the Examiner noted that the certified copy of the priority document has not been filed. In fact, however, certified copy was filed with the application papers on March 8, 2001, as evidenced by the attached photocopy of the date-stamped serial number postcard. The Applicants request acknowledgement of the filing of the certified copy, in the next communication from the Examiner.

The specification and abstract have been amended to address concerns raised by the Examiner on Page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over PR Newswire (PRN) in view of M2 Presswire (M2P). The Applicants traverse as follows.

The claims have been amended to improve their clarity, without narrowing the scope of the claims. The Applicants submit that the claims as originally filed are fully distinguishable from the combination of PRN AND M2P.

For example, although PRN is cited as teaching the use of prompts that lead consumers to appropriate merchandise

selections, a reorder feature, and the sale of refurbished product with new warranties, these teachings do not constitute the claimed method step of preparing customer-side equipment, prior to being supplied to a customer, with the address of information service equipment stored in a storage of the customer-side equipment, or the step of furnishing the customer-side equipment with a means to read the address from the storage and make a connection to the information service equipment in response to a request by the user (Claim 1, for example; see also Claim 14 and Claim 16). Further, PRN does not disclose the step of furnishing the customer-side equipment with a means of displaying a dialog window that asks whether the user wants to connect to the information service equipment as soon as the customer-side equipment is powered on, the means being furnished to the customer-side equipment prior to the customer-side equipment being supplied to the customer (Claim 2, for example; see also Claim 15 and Claim 19).

The Applicants note that the Office Action asserts that PRN teaches online registration for consumers making a first purchase, each consumer being greeted with a personal welcome page on subsequent online visits, and selling to consumers refurbished products via the website available with new

warranties. However, these features of PRN are either not limitations in the claims or are stated more broadly than the claims require.

The Office Action notes that PRN does not teach a consumer product having capability to access an online registration website, but cites M2P as teaching Sony computer products that are sold with a warranty that can be extended by purchasing an additional warranty pack using pre-installed software that provides quick access and to support information and allows for online registration.

Nevertheless, M2P does not teach information service equipment that creates a customer web page as required by customer-side equipment, and that sends the address of the created web page to the customer-side equipment (Claim 3). M2P also does not teach that the information service equipment keeps the customer webpage linked to product data on the customer-side equipment (Claim 4).

In addition, M2P does not teach that the information service equipment links the customer webpage to a webpage for offering information about a product other than the customer-side equipment upon receipt of the address of the webpage of the product. The address being received from the customer-side equipment to which the address of the customer webpage


has been sent (Claim 5).

Independent Claim 6 is directed to a customer service method that includes a step of creating a customer webpage linked to a webpage for offering product information on the customer-side equipment, based on information received from the customer-side equipment, and notifying the customer-side equipment of the address of the customer webpage. Thus, for the same reason that Claim 3 is patentable (at least), independent Claim 6 is patentable over the combination of PRN and M2P. Inherently, then, Claims 7-13 are all patentable based on their dependency on Claim 6. The Applicants note, however, that these dependent claims are also separably patentable because neither PRN nor M2P disclose the access and employment of a customer webpage as set forth in those claims.

Claims 7 and 20-28 also contain limitations relating to the creation, linking, and employment of a customer webpage with regard to products and product information, using terms that patentably define over the combination of PRN and M2P for reasons already advanced as well as other reasons which are not set forth here, for brevity. Accordingly, these claims also should be found allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks,
Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the
rejections and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel J. Stanger
Registration No. 32,846
Attorney for Applicant

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22301
(703) 684-1120
Date: April 6, 2005